$\mathcal{N}=3$ Supersymmetric Effective Action of D2-branes in Massive IIA String Theory

Gyungchoon Go[1], O-Kab Kwon[1], D. D. Tolla[1,2]

[1]*Department of Physics, BK21 Physics Research Division, Institute of Basic Science,*
[2]*University College,*
Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon 440-746, Korea

`gcgo, okab, ddtolla@skku.edu`

Abstract

We obtain a new-type of $\mathcal{N}=3$ Yang-Mills Chern-Simons theory from the Mukhi-Papageorgakis Higgsing of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ Gaiotto-Tomasiello theory. This theory has $\mathcal{N}=1$ BPS fuzzy funnel solution which is expressed in terms of the seven generators of SU(3), excluding T_8. We propose that this is an effective theory of multiple D2-branes with D6- and D8-branes background in massive IIA string theory.

Contents

1   Introduction

Three dimensional Yang-Mills Chern-Simons (YM CS) theories can be realized on brane configurations in type II string theory in two ways. On one hand, one can start with the Hanany-Witten type brane configuration which contains D3-branes stretched between two parallel NS5-branes in type IIB string theory [1]. The corresponding gauge theory is (2+1)-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ YM theory. When one of the NS5-brane is replaced by a $(1,k)$5-brane, CS term with CS level k arises in the corresponding gauge theories and the supersymmetry is broken to $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2, 3$ depending on the orientation of the $(1,k)$5-brane with respect to the other NS5-brane [2, 3]. For further progress on this issue, see [4, 5, 6, 7]. This method of generating the CS term was also used in the type IIB brane configuration of the Aharony-Bergman-Jafferis-Maldacena (ABJM) theory [8], which describes the dynamics of M2-branes on $\mathbb{C}^4/\mathbb{Z}_k$ orbifold singularity. See also [9, 10, 11]. On the other hand, CS terms are also needed in describing D3(2)-branes dynamics in the background of D7(8)-branes [12, 13]. In this case the CS term is generated by the monodromy due to the presence of the D7-brane [15] in type IIB brane configurations. The corresponding CS term in massive IIA

brane configurations is obtained by *massive* T-duality [14]. This phenomenon is closely related with the brane configuration of the Gaiotto-Tomasiello (GT) theories [16, 17]. In particular, by introducing D7-branes to the type IIB brane configuration of ABJM theory, Bergman and Lifschytz constructed the brane configuration of the $\mathcal{N} = 0$ GT theory [18]. For $\mathcal{N} = 3$, see [19].[1]

The dimensional reduction of the ABJM theory with U$(N)\times$U(N) gauge symmetry [8] via the Mukhi-Papageorgakis (MP) Higgsing procedure [23] results in the $(2+1)$-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetric YM theory with U(N) gauge symmetry [24, 25]. The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory [16] was obtained from the ABJM theory by shifting the CS levels of the two gauge groups, so that $k_1 + k_2 \neq 0$. Apparently, the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory is a minor deformation of the ABJM theory, however, there are unanswered questions about this theory. This is mainly because of the fact that there is no clear argument about the related brane system. In order to clarify this point, we apply the MP Higgsing procedure to the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory and obtain $(2+1)$-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory with U(N) gauge symmetry and CS level $k_1 + k_2 = F_0$. This $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory is different from the one studied in [26, 27] because it contains four massless scalar fields and their fermionic superpartners in addition to the three massive scalar fields in the massive vector multiplet, which are also present in the latter theory. It is also true that our theory has $\mathcal{N} = 1$ BPS fuzzy funnel solution and $(\mathbf{R}^4 \times S^1)^N / S_N$ vacuum moduli space while these are trivial in the theory in [26, 27].

Even though the brane configuration for the original $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory is unclear, the structure of the moduli space and the fuzzy funnel solution provide an insight in to the branes configuration for our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory. In this paper we argue that in massive IIA string theory, YM CS theories with U(N) gauge symmetry describe the low energy dynamics of N coincident D2-branes in the background of D8-brane.[2] We also show that the presence of three massive and four massless scalar fields, which are matter contents of our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory, implies the branes system should contain D6-branes. More precisely, the brane system includes N coincident D2-branes in the background of $|F_0|$ D8-branes, which have one common spacial direction with the D2-branes, and $|F_0|$ D6-branes, which have two common spacial directions with the D2-branes. The four massless scalar fields represent the position of the D2-branes inside the worldvolume of the D6-branes while the three massive scalar fields represent the position of the D2-branes along the directions transverse to the D6-branes in the presence of the background D8-branes.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we apply the MP Higgsing procedure to the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory and obtain $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory. In section 3, we find the vacuum moduli space and $\mathcal{N} = 1$ BPS fuzzy funnel solution. In section 4, we propose the brane

---

[1]Some aspects of $\mathcal{N} = 2, 3$ GT theories were also discussed in [20, 21, 22].

[2]See [28, 29] for earlier considerations in the case of single D2-brane.

configuration for our $\mathcal{N}=3$ YM CS theory. In section 5, we discuss our results and propose the type IIB brane configuration of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ GT theory.

2 $\mathcal{N}=3$ YM CS Theory

2.1 $\mathcal{N}=3$ GT Theory

Based on the $\mathcal{N}=2$ superfield formulation of [16], the component field expansions of the GT theories were obtained in [22]. For clarity of presentation we copy the Lagrangian of the $\mathcal{N}=3$ GT theory,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{N}=3} = \mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{CS}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{ferm}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}}, \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \text{tr}\Big[-D_\mu Z_A^\dagger D^\mu Z^A - D_\mu W^{\dagger A} D^\mu W_A + i\xi_A^\dagger \gamma^\mu D_\mu \xi^A + i\omega^{\dagger A} \gamma^\mu D_\mu \omega_A \Big],$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{CS}} = \frac{k_1}{4\pi}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\text{tr}\Big(A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho + \frac{2i}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho \Big) + \frac{k_2}{4\pi}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\text{tr}\Big(\hat{A}_\mu \partial_\nu \hat{A}_\rho + \frac{2i}{3} \hat{A}_\mu \hat{A}_\nu \hat{A}_\rho \Big),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{ferm}} = -\frac{2\pi i}{k_1}\text{tr}\Big[(\xi^A \xi_A^\dagger - \omega^{\dagger A}\omega_A)(Z^B Z_B^\dagger - W^{\dagger B}W_B) + 2(Z^A \xi_A^\dagger - \omega^{\dagger A}W_A)(\xi^B Z_B^\dagger - W^{\dagger B}\omega_B) \Big]$$

$$-\frac{2\pi i}{k_2}\text{tr}\Big[(\xi_A^\dagger \xi^A - \omega_A \omega^{\dagger A})(Z_B^\dagger Z^B - W_B W^{\dagger B}) + 2(Z_A^\dagger \xi^A - \omega_A W^{\dagger A})(\xi_B^\dagger Z^B - W_B \omega^{\dagger B}) \Big]$$

$$-\frac{2\pi}{k_1}\text{tr}\Big(Z^A \omega_A Z^B \omega_B + \xi^A W_A \xi^B W_B + 2Z^A W_A \xi^B \omega_B + 2Z^A \omega_A \xi^B W_B$$

$$- \omega^{\dagger A}Z_A^\dagger \omega^{\dagger B}Z_B^\dagger - W^{\dagger A}\xi_A^\dagger W^{\dagger B}\xi_B^\dagger - 2\omega^{\dagger A}\xi_A^\dagger W^{\dagger B}Z_B^\dagger - 2W^{\dagger A}\xi_A^\dagger \omega^{\dagger B}Z_B^\dagger \Big)$$

$$-\frac{2\pi}{k_2}\text{tr}\Big(\omega_A Z^A \omega_B Z^B + W_A \xi^A W_B \xi^B + 2\omega_A Z^A W_B \xi^B + 2W_A Z^A \omega_B \xi^B$$

$$- Z_A^\dagger \omega^{\dagger A}Z_B^\dagger \omega^{\dagger B} - \xi_A^\dagger W^{\dagger A}\xi_B^\dagger W^{\dagger B} - 2\xi_A^\dagger W^{\dagger A}Z_B^\dagger \omega^{\dagger B} - 2\xi_A^\dagger \omega^{\dagger A}Z_B^\dagger W^{\dagger B} \Big),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}} = -\frac{4\pi^2}{k_1^2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(Z^A Z_A^\dagger + W^{\dagger A}W_A \big)\big(Z^B Z_B^\dagger - W^{\dagger B}W_B \big)(Z^C Z_C^\dagger - W^{\dagger C}W_C) \Big]$$

$$-\frac{8\pi^2}{k_1 k_2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(Z^A Z_A^\dagger - W^{\dagger A}W_A \big)Z^B(Z_C^\dagger Z^C - W_C W^{\dagger C})Z_B^\dagger$$

$$+ \big(Z^A Z_A^\dagger - W^{\dagger A}W_A \big)W^{\dagger B}(Z_C^\dagger Z^C - W_C W^{\dagger C})W_B \Big]$$

$$-\frac{4\pi^2}{k_2^2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(Z_A^\dagger Z^A + W_A W^{\dagger A} \big)\big(Z_B^\dagger Z^B - W_B W^{\dagger B} \big)(Z_C^\dagger Z^C - W_C W^{\dagger C}) \Big]$$

$$- 4\text{tr}\Big[\big(\frac{2\pi}{k_1}W_A Z^B W_B + \frac{2\pi}{k_2}W_B Z^B W_A \big)\big(\frac{2\pi}{k_1}W^{\dagger C}Z_C^\dagger W^{\dagger A} + \frac{2\pi}{k_2}W^{\dagger A}Z_C^\dagger W^{\dagger C} \big)$$

$$+ \big(\frac{2\pi}{k_1}Z^B W_B Z^A + \frac{2\pi}{k_2}Z^A W_B Z^B \big)\big(\frac{2\pi}{k_1}Z_A^\dagger W^{\dagger C}Z_C^\dagger + \frac{2\pi}{k_2}Z_C^\dagger W^{\dagger C}Z_A^\dagger \big) \Big]. \tag{2.2}$$

4

In $\mathcal{N} = 2$ superfield formalism Z^A and W_A ($A = 1, 2$) are the scalar components of chiral superfields $\mathcal{Z}^A$ and $\mathcal{W}_A$, respectively, whereas ξ^A and ω_A are their fermionic superpartners. A_μ and $\hat{A}_\mu$ are the vector components of the vector superfields $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$, respectively. The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ supersymmetry transformation rules for these component fields are as follows [22]:

$$\delta Z^A = i\bar{\epsilon}\xi^A - \eta\omega^{\dagger A}, \quad \delta W_A = i\bar{\epsilon}\omega_A + \eta\xi^\dagger_A,$$

$$\delta\xi^A = -D_\mu Z^A \gamma^\mu \epsilon - \sigma_1 Z^A \epsilon + Z^A \sigma_2 \epsilon - \frac{4\pi i}{k_1}\bar{\epsilon}W^{\dagger B}Z^\dagger_B W^{\dagger A} - \frac{4\pi i}{k_2}\bar{\epsilon}W^{\dagger A}Z^\dagger_B W^{\dagger B}$$

$$+ iD_\mu W^{\dagger A}\gamma^\mu \eta + i\eta\sigma_1 W^{\dagger A} - i\eta W^{\dagger A}\sigma_2 + \frac{4\pi i}{k_1}\eta W^{\dagger B}Z^\dagger_B Z^A + \frac{4\pi i}{k_2}\eta Z^A Z^\dagger_B W^{\dagger B},$$

$$\delta\omega_A = -D_\mu W_A \gamma^\mu \epsilon + W_A \sigma_1 \epsilon - \sigma_2 W_A \epsilon - \frac{4\pi i}{k_1}\bar{\epsilon}Z^\dagger_A W^{\dagger B}Z^\dagger_B - \frac{4\pi i}{k_2}\bar{\epsilon}Z^\dagger_B W^{\dagger B}Z^\dagger_A$$

$$- iD_\mu Z^\dagger_A \gamma^\mu \eta + i\eta Z^\dagger_A \sigma_1 - i\eta\sigma_2 Z^\dagger_A - \frac{4\pi i}{k_1}\eta W_A W^{\dagger B}Z^\dagger_B - \frac{4\pi i}{k_2}\eta Z^\dagger_B W^{\dagger B}W_A,$$

$$\delta A_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_\mu\bar{\chi}_1 + \chi_1\gamma_\mu\epsilon\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\eta\gamma_\mu\zeta_1 - i\bar{\zeta}_1\gamma_\mu\eta\right),$$

$$\delta \hat{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{\epsilon}\gamma_\mu\bar{\chi}_2 + \chi_2\gamma_\mu\epsilon\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\eta\gamma_\mu\zeta_2 - i\bar{\zeta}_2\gamma_\mu\eta\right), \tag{2.3}$$

where ϵ and $\bar{\epsilon}$ are complex two component spinor and its complex conjugate, whereas η is a complex spinor satisfying $\bar{\eta} = -i\eta$. Here we also defined

$$\sigma_1 \equiv \frac{2\pi}{k_1}\left(Z^B Z^\dagger_B - W^{\dagger B}W_B\right), \qquad \sigma_2 \equiv -\frac{2\pi}{k_2}\left(Z^\dagger_B Z^B - W_B W^{\dagger B}\right),$$

$$\chi_1 \equiv -\frac{4\pi}{k_1}\left(Z^A \xi^\dagger_A - \omega^{\dagger A}W_A\right), \qquad \chi_2 \equiv \frac{4\pi}{k_2}\left(\xi^\dagger_A Z^A - W_A \omega^{\dagger A}\right),$$

$$\zeta_1 \equiv \frac{4\pi}{k_1}\left(\xi^A W_A + Z^A \omega_A\right), \qquad \zeta_2 \equiv \frac{4\pi}{k_2}\left(W_A \xi^A + \omega_A Z^A\right). \tag{2.4}$$

In the next subsection we apply the MP Higgsing procedure to the Lagrangian (2.1) and the corresponding supersymmetry transformation rules (2.3) and obtain the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory.

2.2   MP Higgsing of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT Theory

An important step in the MP Higgsing procedure is to turn on vacuum expectation value v for a scalar fields along which the bosonic potential is flat. The only flat directions for the bosonic potential in the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory are the tilted directions, $Z^1 \pm W^{\dagger 2}$ and $Z^2 \pm W^{\dagger 1}$. In order to turn on the vacuum expectation value for a specific field, it is convenient to make field redefinitions which align the scalars along the flat directions of the potential. The appropriate field redefinitions

for bifundamental fields are

$$Z^A = \frac{X^A - Y^{\dagger A}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad W^{\dagger A} = \frac{\sigma^A_B(X^B + Y^{\dagger B})}{\sqrt{2}},$$

$$\xi^A = \frac{\chi^A - i\lambda^{\dagger A}}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \omega^{\dagger A} = \frac{\sigma^A_B(\lambda^{\dagger B} - i\chi^B)}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{2.5}$$

where σ^A_B is the Pauli matrix σ_1. The $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT Lagrangian is rewritten in terms of the redefined fields in appendix A.

The MP Higgsing procedure of the ABJM theory involves a double scaling limit of large vacuum expectation value and CS level k, keeping the ratio v/k finite. This can be applicable to the GT theory by setting $k_1 = k$ and $k_2 = -k + F_0$ and taking the same scaling limit.[3] The appearance of the Chern-Simons levels in the fermionic and bosonic potentials suggests the following expansions in powers of $1/k$ for finite F_0,

$$\frac{1}{k_2} = -\frac{1}{k}\Big(1 + \frac{F_0}{k} + \cdots\Big),$$

$$\frac{1}{k_2^2} = \frac{1}{k^2}\Big(1 + \frac{2F_0}{k} + \frac{3F_0^2}{k^2} + \cdots\Big),$$

$$\frac{1}{k_1 k_2} = -\frac{1}{k^2}\Big(1 + \frac{F_0}{k} + \frac{F_0^2}{k^2} + \cdots\Big). \tag{2.6}$$

We proceed by turning on the vacuum expectation value for a scalar field, which breaks the gauge symmetry from U(N)×U(N) to U(N) as follows:

$$X^A = \tilde{X}^A + i\tilde{X}^{A+4}, \qquad Y^{\dagger A} = \frac{v}{2}T^0\delta^{A2} + \tilde{X}^{A+2} + i\tilde{X}^{A+6},$$

$$\chi^A = \psi_A + i\psi_{A+4}, \qquad \lambda^{\dagger A} = \psi_{A+2} + i\psi_{A+6}. \tag{2.7}$$

Here the fields $\tilde{X}^i(i = 1, \cdots, 8)$ and $\psi_r(r = 1, \cdots, 8)$ are Hermitian and transform in the adjoint representation of the unbroken U(N) gauge group. In the double scaling limit of $v, k \to \infty$ with finite v/k, the covariant derivatives for the bosonic and fermionic fields are written as

$$D_\mu Y^{\dagger 2} = \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^4 + iv\big(A^-_\mu + \frac{1}{v}\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^8\big) \to \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^4 + iv A^-_\mu,$$

$$D_\mu Y^{\dagger 1} = \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^3 + i\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^7, \quad D_\mu X^A = \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^A + i\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^{A+4},$$

$$D_\mu \xi^A = \tilde{D}_\mu \psi^A + i\tilde{D}_\mu \psi^{A+4}, \quad D_\mu \omega^{\dagger A} = \tilde{D}_\mu \psi^{A+2} + i\tilde{D}_\mu \psi^{A+6}, \tag{2.8}$$

where $A^\pm_\mu = \frac{1}{2}(A_\mu \pm \hat{A}_\mu)$, $\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X} = \partial_\mu \tilde{X} + i[A^+_\mu, \tilde{X}]$, and we have made the gauge choice $A^-_\mu \to A^-_\mu - \frac{1}{v}\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^8$ in the first line. In writing (2.8) we have also used the fact that the auxiliary field A^-_μ is of the order $\frac{1}{v}$ and neglected terms of this order or higher.

---

[3]In massive type IIA gravity, which is the gravity dual of the GT theory, F_0 is identified as the Romans mass [30].

Using (2.7) and (2.8), from the kinetic and the Chern-Simons terms in the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT Lagrangian we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{CS}} = \text{tr}\Big[&- \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^i \tilde{D}^\mu \tilde{X}^i - v^2 A_\mu^- A^{-\mu} + \frac{k}{2\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} A_\mu^- \tilde{F}_{\nu\rho} + i\psi_r \gamma^\mu \tilde{D}_\mu \psi_r \\
&+ \frac{F_0}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \Big(A_\mu^+ \partial_\nu A_\rho^+ + \frac{2i}{3} A_\mu^+ A_\nu^+ A_\rho^+ \Big) \Big] + \mathcal{O}\big(\frac{1}{v}\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}
$$

where $\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu^+ - \partial_\nu A_\mu^+ + i[A_\mu^+, A_\nu^+]$ and $i = 1, \cdots 7$ since $\tilde{X}^8$ is eliminated by the gauge choice. Solving the equation of motion for the auxiliary gauge field A_μ^- we can expresses it in terms of the field strength of the dynamical gauge field A_μ^+ as

$$
A_\mu^- = \frac{k}{4\pi v^2} \epsilon_\mu{}^{\nu\rho} \tilde{F}_{\nu\rho} = \frac{1}{2gv} \epsilon_\mu{}^{\nu\rho} \tilde{F}_{\nu\rho}, \tag{2.10}
$$

where $g = \frac{2\pi v}{k}$ is the Yang-Mills coupling. For dimensional reason it is also necessary to rescale all the matter fields as $\phi \to \frac{1}{g}\phi$. Then we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0 + \mathcal{L}_{\text{CS}} &= \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{YM}} + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_0 + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{CS}} \\
&= \frac{1}{g^2} \text{tr}\Big[-\frac{1}{2} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} - \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^i \tilde{D}^\mu \tilde{X}^i + i\psi_r \gamma^\mu \tilde{D}_\mu \psi_r + \frac{F_0 g^2}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \Big(A_\mu^+ \partial_\nu A_\rho^+ + \frac{2i}{3} A_\mu^+ A_\nu^+ A_\rho^+ \Big) \Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{2.11}
$$

Using (2.6) and (2.7) the Higgsing of the potential terms is tedious but straightforward. In particular, from the fermionic potential we obtain Yukawa type coupling and fermionic mass term, which are given by

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ferm}} = \text{tr}\Big(\frac{iF_0}{4\pi} \mu^{rs} \psi_r \psi_s - \frac{1}{g^2} \Gamma_i^{rs} \psi_r [\tilde{X}^i, \psi_s] \Big), \tag{2.12}
$$

where Γ_i^{rs}'s are seven dimensional Euclidian gamma matrices in a particular representation which is determined by the Higgsing procedure (see appendix B), and μ^{rs} is fermionic mass matrix given by

$$
\mu = \frac{1}{2}
\begin{pmatrix}
-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

For convenience we write the Lagrangian in terms of the fermionic fields which are eigenstates of this mass matrix. The mass matrix can be diagonalized by an orthogonal matrix as follows

$$\tilde{\mu} = O^T \mu O = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \tag{2.13}$$

where O is given by

$$O = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the fermionic mass eigenstates are

$$\tilde{\psi}_r = \psi_s O^{sr}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\psi_5 - \psi_1, \ \psi_8 + \psi_4, \ \psi_7 - \psi_3, \ \psi_6 + \psi_2, \ \psi_8 - \psi_4, \ \psi_7 + \psi_3, \ \psi_6 - \psi_2, \ \psi_5 + \psi_1). \tag{2.14}$$

This transformation also modifies the gamma matrices as

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_i = O^T \Gamma_i O. \tag{2.15}$$

Then we can write

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{ferm}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \text{tr}\left(\frac{iF_0 g^2}{4\pi} \tilde{\mu}^{rs} \tilde{\psi}_r \tilde{\psi}_s - \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs} \tilde{\psi}_r [\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{\psi}_s] \right). \tag{2.16}$$

The fermionic kinetic term in (2.11) is invariant under the transformation (2.14).

The Higgsing of the bosonic potential is even more involved than that of the fermionic potential, however, the algebraic procedure is similar. As a result of such lengthy algebra we obtain[4]

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{bos}} = \frac{1}{g^2} \text{tr}\left(-\frac{F_0^2 g^4}{16\pi^2} M_{ij} \tilde{X}^i \tilde{X}^j - \frac{iF_0 g^2}{2\pi} \tilde{T}_{ijk} \tilde{X}^i [\tilde{X}^j, \tilde{X}^k] + \frac{1}{2} [\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j]^2 \right), \tag{2.17}$$

where the nonvanishing components of the bosonic mass matrix M_{ij} and the antisymmetric constant tensor $\tilde{T}_{ijk}$ are

$$M_{33} = M_{44} = M_{55} = 1,$$

$$\tilde{T}_{567} = -\tilde{T}_{468} = \tilde{T}_{369} = \tilde{T}_{345} = \tilde{T}_{378} = \tilde{T}_{479} = \tilde{T}_{589} = \frac{1}{6}. \tag{2.18}$$

---

[4]For later convenience we have made renaming of scalar fields as follow: $\tilde{X}^1 \to \tilde{X}^6$, $\tilde{X}^2 \to \tilde{X}^3$, $\tilde{X}^3 \to \tilde{X}^4$, $\tilde{X}^4 \to \tilde{X}^7$, $\tilde{X}^5 \to \tilde{X}^5$, $\tilde{X}^6 \to \tilde{X}^8$, $\tilde{X}^7 \to \tilde{X}^9$. The same renaming applies to the gamma matrices $\tilde{\Gamma}_i$.

In summary, the total Lagrangian of the Higgsed theory is written as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{YM}} + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{F_0}, \tag{2.19}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{YM}} = \frac{1}{g^2}\text{tr}\Big(-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} - \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^i \tilde{D}^\mu \tilde{X}^i + i\psi_r \gamma^\mu \tilde{D}_\mu \psi_r - \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs}\tilde{\psi}_r[\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{\psi}_s] + \frac{1}{2}[\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j]^2\Big), \tag{2.20}$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{F_0} = \frac{F_0}{4\pi}\text{tr}\Big(\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}\big(A_\mu^+ \partial_\nu A_\rho^+ + \frac{2i}{3}A_\mu^+ A_\nu^+ A_\rho^+\big) + i\tilde{\mu}^{rs}\tilde{\psi}_r \tilde{\psi}_s - 2i\tilde{T}_{ijk}\tilde{X}^i[\tilde{X}^j, \tilde{X}^k] - \frac{F_0 g^2}{4\pi}M_{ij}\tilde{X}^i \tilde{X}^j\Big).$$

This is the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory anticipated at the end of the previous subsection. For vanishing F_0 this reduces to $\mathcal{N} = 8$ super YM theory as expected. In literature (2+1)-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory was already studied [26, 27]. In this case the theory can be obtained from the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ YM theory by adding CS term, which breaks one supersymmetry. The field contents of the later differ from the field contents our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory by four massless scalars and their superpartners. The Lagrangian of [26, 27] can also be obtained by turning off four scalar fields $\tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9}$ and four Majorana fermions $\tilde{\psi}_{5,6,7,8}$ in our YM CS Lagrangian.

The supersymmetry transformation rules of (2.19) are obtained as a result of the Higgsing of the corresponding transformation rules in the original GT theory given in (2.3)

$$\delta A_\mu^+ = i\epsilon_r \gamma_\mu \tilde{\psi}_r, \qquad \delta \tilde{X}^i = i\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs}\epsilon_r \tilde{\psi}_s,$$

$$\delta \tilde{\psi}_r = i\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_r + \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs}\gamma^\mu \epsilon_s \tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{X}^i - \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{rs}\epsilon_s[\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j] - \frac{F_0 g^2}{4\pi}\tilde{\mu}^{rs}\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{st}\epsilon_t \tilde{X}^i, \tag{2.21}$$

where the nonvanishing supersymmetry parameters are

$$\epsilon_2 = -\frac{1+i}{2\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\epsilon} - i\epsilon), \quad \epsilon_3 = -\frac{1-i}{\sqrt{2}}\eta, \quad \epsilon_4 = \frac{1-i}{2\sqrt{2}}(\bar{\epsilon} + i\epsilon), \tag{2.22}$$

and

$$\sigma^{\mu\nu} = -\frac{i}{4}\big(\gamma^\mu \gamma^\nu - \gamma^\nu \gamma^\mu\big), \qquad \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij} = \frac{i}{4}\big(\tilde{\Gamma}_i \tilde{\Gamma}_j - \tilde{\Gamma}_j \tilde{\Gamma}_i\big). \tag{2.23}$$

Actually, the Higgsing of (2.3) gives the supersymmetric transformation rules of the dynamical fields, which are the seven scalar fields $\tilde{X}^i$, the eight fermionic fields $\tilde{\psi}_r$, and the gauge field A_μ^+, as well as the transformation rules for the auxiliary gauge field A_μ^-, and the would-be Goldstone boson $\tilde{X}^8$. However, the fields A_μ^- and $\tilde{X}^8$ are integrated out from the action and their transformation rules, which are not listed in (2.21), are irrelevant.

3 Vacuum Moduli Space and Fuzzy Funnel Solution

3.1 Vacuum moduli space

In order to understand the brane configuration for our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory in (2.19), we start by figuring out the vacuum moduli space of the theory. The bosonic potential in (2.17) can be written in a positive-definite form as follows:

$$V_{\text{bos}} = \frac{1}{4g^2} \sum_{r=1}^{8} \left| \left((1-i)\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{r2} - (1+i)\tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{r4}\right) [\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j] + \beta\tilde{\mu}^{rs} \left((1-i)\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{s2} - (1+i)\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{s4}\right) \tilde{X}^i \right|^2, \quad (3.24)$$

where $\beta \equiv \dfrac{F_0 g^2}{4\pi}$ and we have introduced the notation $|\mathcal{O}|^2 \equiv \text{tr}\mathcal{O}^\dagger \mathcal{O}$. We obtain the vacuum equations from this positive-definite potential,

$$[\tilde{X}^a, \tilde{X}^b] = 0, \quad [\tilde{X}^a, \tilde{X}^p] = 0,$$
$$\beta\tilde{X}^3 + i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^9] + [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^8]) = 0,$$
$$\beta\tilde{X}^4 - i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^8] - [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^9]) = 0,$$
$$\beta\tilde{X}^5 + i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^7] + [\tilde{X}^8, \tilde{X}^9]) = 0, \quad (3.25)$$

where $a, b = 3, 4, 5$, $p = 6, 7, 8, 9$. The solution of (3.25) is

$$\tilde{X}^a = 0, \qquad \tilde{X}^p = diagonal \ matrices. \quad (3.26)$$

The diagonal matrices $\tilde{X}^p$'s represent the full moduli space of the theory. The fact that the $N \times N$ scalar fields are diagonal on the vacuum moduli indicates that the U(N) gauge symmetry of the theory is broken to U(1)$^N \times S_N$, where the S_N permutes the diagonal elements of the matrices. Thus the moduli space including the effect of the dual photon in (2+1)-dimensions is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \frac{(\text{R}^4 \times S^1)^N}{S_N}. \quad (3.27)$$

3.2 Fuzzy funnel solution

In this subsection, we will obtain fuzzy funnel solution of BPS equations in our $\mathcal{N}$=3 YM CS theory. The Killing spinor equation of the supersymmetry variation (2.21) is written as

$$\delta\tilde{\psi}_r = i\tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_r + \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs}\gamma^\mu\epsilon_s\tilde{D}_\mu\tilde{X}^i - \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{rs}\epsilon_s[\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j] - \beta\tilde{\mu}^{rs}\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{st}\epsilon_t\tilde{X}^i = 0. \quad (3.28)$$

In order to obtain a fuzzy funnel solution, we consider the following projection to the supersymmetry parameters, $\gamma^2\epsilon_{2,3} = \epsilon_{2,3}$ and also set $\epsilon_4 = 0$. The resulting fuzzy funnel solution reduces

the number of supersymmetries by 1/3, i.e., it has $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry. We also assume the vanishing gauge field and a static configuration. Under these conditions, the BPS equations are

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs} \partial_1 \tilde{X}^i = 0,$$
$$\tilde{\Gamma}_i^{rs} \partial_2 \tilde{X}^i - \tilde{\Gamma}_{ij}^{rs} [\tilde{X}^i, \tilde{X}^j] - \beta \mu^{rt} \tilde{\Gamma}_i^{ts} \tilde{X}^i = 0. \tag{3.29}$$

The first line of (3.29) can be satisfied by choosing a configuration which does not depend on x_1 direction. From the second line of (3.29) we have

$$\partial_2 \tilde{X}^3 - i[\tilde{X}^4, \tilde{X}^5] = 0, \qquad \partial_2 \tilde{X}^5 - i[\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^4] = 0,$$
$$\partial_2 \tilde{X}^4 - \beta \tilde{X}^4 + i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^8] + [\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^5] - [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^9]) = 0,$$
$$\beta \tilde{X}^3 + i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^9] + [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^8]) = 0, \qquad \beta \tilde{X}^5 + i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^7] + [\tilde{X}^8, \tilde{X}^9]) = 0,$$
$$\partial_2 \tilde{X}^6 - i[\tilde{X}^4, \tilde{X}^8] = 0, \qquad \partial_2 \tilde{X}^7 + i[\tilde{X}^4, \tilde{X}^9] = 0,$$
$$\partial_2 \tilde{X}^8 - i[\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^4] = 0, \qquad \partial_2 \tilde{X}^9 - i[\tilde{X}^4, \tilde{X}^7] = 0,$$
$$[\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^5] - [\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^8] = 0, \qquad [\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^3] + [\tilde{X}^5, \tilde{X}^8] = 0,$$
$$[\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^7] + [\tilde{X}^5, \tilde{X}^9] = 0, \qquad [\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^9] + [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^5] = 0. \tag{3.30}$$

Comparing the equation in the second line with the remaining equations, it appears natural to divide it into the following two equations

$$\beta \tilde{X}^4 - i([\tilde{X}^6, \tilde{X}^8] - [\tilde{X}^7, \tilde{X}^9]) = 0, \qquad \partial_2 \tilde{X}^4 + i[\tilde{X}^3, \tilde{X}^5] = 0. \tag{3.31}$$

Then from the first and the second lines of (3.30) we obtain

$$\partial_2 \tilde{X}^a = i\epsilon^{abc} [\tilde{X}^b, \tilde{X}^c], \qquad (a, b, c = 3, 4, 5). \tag{3.32}$$

These are the Nahm equations with the fuzzy two sphere solution, in which the scalar fields $\tilde{X}^{3,4,5}$ are proportional to the generators of SU(2). However, the fuzzy two sphere configuration does not satisfy the remaining equations in (3.30). It is also important to notice that there is no nontrivial solution satisfying the equations (3.30) in the case of U(2) gauge group. For $N \geq 3$, an interesting solution exists and it can be expressed in terms of seven generators of SU(3). Explicitly, we can write

$$\tilde{X}^3 = g(x_2) T_1, \qquad \tilde{X}^4 = g(x_2) T_2, \qquad \tilde{X}^5 = g(x_2) T_3, \tag{3.33}$$

where $T_{1,2,3}$'s are the SU(2) subgroup elements of N-dimensional representation of SU(3). Then from (3.32) we easily obtain

$$g(x_2) = \frac{1}{x_2}.$$

11

The remaining equations of (3.30) can be solved by choosing $\tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9}$ in terms of the rest of generators of SU(3), excluding T_8,

$$\tilde{X}^6 = h(x_2)\,T_4, \qquad \tilde{X}^7 = h(x_2)\,T_5, \qquad \tilde{X}^8 = -h(x_2)\,T_6, \qquad \tilde{X}^9 = h(x_2)\,T_7, \qquad (3.34)$$

where

$$h(x_2) = \pm\sqrt{\beta\,g(x_2)} = \pm\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{x_2}}.$$

Here we would like to point out an important difference between our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory and a similar theory in [26, 27]. As we pointed out before, the latter theory can be obtained from ours by turning off four massless scalar fields, $\tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9}$, which means in that case the fuzzy funnel solution in (3.33) and (3.34) is not allowed for nonvanishing β. As we will see in the next section, together with the vacuum moduli space, this $\mathcal{N} = 1$ BPS solution provides useful insights about the brane configuration of our theory.

4 Brane Configuration

4.1 Generation of CS terms

In order to pave a way for the understanding of the brane configuration, which can be described by our YM CS theory obtained in section 2, we briefly summarize some brane configurations in the literature. These brane configurations are described by gauge theories involving CS terms. We start with a type IIB brane system where two parallel NS5-branes separated along one direction of the worldvolume of N D3-branes. The remaining two worldvolume coordinates of the D3-branes are parallel to the corresponding coordinates of NS5-branes. In the low energy limit, this configuration is described by (2+1)-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ YM theory with gauge group U(N) [1], where all fields transform in the adjoint representations. Since the two NS5-branes are parallel, the three scalar fields, representing the positions of the D3-branes inside the worldvolume of NS5-branes, are massless.

Now we replace one of the NS5-branes with a (1,k)5-brane (a bound state of an NS5-brane and k D5-branes) in a tilted direction with respect to the other NS5-brane. Then the D3-branes cannot move freely and this fact translates into mass terms for the three scalar fields on the field theory side. The $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetry of the original theory is broken to $\mathcal{N} = 1, 2, 3$ theories, depending on the choice of the direction of the (1,k)5-brane. The corresponding effective field theories for these cases are obtained by including the CS terms with CS level k in supersymmetric

ways [2, 3]. Such CS term is introduced in order to cancel the surface term originated from the boundary condition of the $(1,k)$5-brane in the equation of motion of the gauge field [2, 3].

The brane configuration of the ABJM theory [8] is based on the brane system of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory [26, 27]. An important difference is the fact that the two parallel NS5-branes are separated along a compact direction of the worldvolume of N D3-branes. In this case, the D3-branes, which wind around the compact direction, can break on the NS5-branes resulting in a $(2+1)$-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS gauge theory with gauge group $U_k(N) \times U_{-k}(N)$ [8]. At the infrared fixed point, this becomes conformal and the supersymmetry is enhanced to $\mathcal{N} = 6$. One can also add l fractional D3-branes, suspended on one side of the interval between the NS5-brane and the $(1,k)$5-brane. Then the corresponding effective field theory becomes $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory with gauge group $U(N + l)_k \times U(N)_{-k}$ or $U(N)_k \times U(N + l)_{-k}$ depending on the side on which the fractional D3-branes are added [10].

Along a different line of thought, CS terms are also required in order to describe brane systems involving D7- or D8-branes [12, 13, 18]. The configuration with D8-branes can be understood by the *massive* T-dualization of that of D7-branes [14]. In [18], a D7-brane was added to the brane configuration of the ABJM theory as follows:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
N D3	●	●	●				●			
1 D7	●	●	●	●	●			●	●	●

Here we have omitted 5-branes for simplicity. This configuration breaks the entire supersymmetry. Since the D7-brane is a pointlike object in the (x_5, x_6)-plane, it sources a SL$(2,\mathbb{Z})$ monodromy on the plane, $\tau \to \tau + 1$,[5] i.e., $C_0 \to C_0 + 2\pi$ for the axion. This monodromy is the result of a branch cut emanated from the D7-brane with the direction of the cut chosen to cross the D3-branes. Then the Wess-Zumino type coupling for the D3-branes generates a CS term:

$$\int_{\mathrm{R}^{2+1}} \int_{x_6} C_0 \mathrm{tr}(F \wedge F) \sim S_{\mathrm{R}^{2+1}}^{\mathrm{CS}}(A). \tag{4.35}$$

To summarize, we have seen two ways to generate the CS term in the descriptions of brane configurations in $(2+1)$-dimensional gauge theories. The CS term in our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory is related to the configuration involving D7- or D8-branes. In the next subsection, we construct the brane configuration for our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory starting with type IIB brane system involving D7-branes.

---

[5]We define the complex combination of the axion field C_0 and the dilaton field ϕ as $\tau \equiv \frac{C_0}{2\pi} + ie^{-\phi}$.

4.2 Massive IIA brane configuration

The type IIA string theory on $AdS_4 \times \mathbb{CP}^3$ with q D8-branes ($q = |F_0|$) wrapped on $\mathbb{CP}^3$ was proposed as a dual gravity of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory [19]. Based on this and the type IIB brane configuration of the $\mathcal{N} = 6$ ABJM theory, we propose the type IIB brane configuration of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory as follows:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	$\hat{6}$	7	8	9
N D3	•	•	•				•			
NS5	•	•	•	•	•	•				
$(1,k)5$	•	•	•	$\cos\theta$	$\cos\theta$	$\cos\theta$		$\sin\theta$	$\sin\theta$	$\sin\theta$
q D5	•	•	•					•	•	•
q D7	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•

Table 1: The NS5-brane, q D5-branes, and q D7-branes are located at the same point along the x_6-direction.

where $\hat{6}$ represents a compact direction and θ is the orientation of the $(1,k)5$-brane relative to NS5-brane in (x_3,x_7)-, (x_4,x_8)-, and (x_5,x_9)-planes, and $\tan\theta = k$, assuming the string coupling $g_s = 1$ and RR axion is vanishing. In addition to the brane configuration of the ABJM theory, this configuration contains q D7-branes and additional q D5-branes in a supersymmetric way. The D7-branes are results of the T-dualization of the D8-branes in the proposal of [19], while the additional D5-branes are included in our proposed brane configuration for the reason that we will explain below.

The MP Higgsing procedure in ABJM theory includes two important steps, which are identification of the two gauge fields with each other and moving the M2-branes far away from the orbifold singularity. In the corresponding brane configuration these actions are interpreted as separating the D3-branes from the five-branes and moving them far away in the transverse directions. After the separation, the T-duality along the compact direction will give the brane configuration with coincident D2-branes, and the corresponding effective field theory is the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ YM theory in $(2+1)$-dimensions. This procedure does not break supersymmetry.

Even though the M-theory uplifting of our proposed brane configuration is unclear, we can apply the MP Higgsing procedure to this brane configuration as well. This corresponds to moving the NS5- and $(1,k)5$-brane far away from the D7-D3-D5-brane system in the transverse directions. This results in the type IIB brane configuration with N D3-branes intersecting q D7-branes along one common spatial direction and q D5-branes along two common spatial directions as follows:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	$\hat{6}$	7	8	9
N D3	•	•	•				•			
q D5	•	•	•					•	•	•
q D7	•	•		•	•	•		•	•	•

Table 2: Type IIB brane configuration for $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory after the MP Higgsing.

Unlike the brane configuration in [18] ours is supersymmetric. Based on the discussion in the previous subsection, q D7-branes generate CS term with CS level $\pm q$ depending on the relative orientation of D3- and D7-branes.

Applying *massive* T-duality along $x_{\hat{6}}$-direction from IIB configuration with D7-branes to massive IIA configuration with D8-branes [14], we obtain the following brane configuration:

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
N D2	•	•	•							
q D6	•	•	•				•	•	•	•
q D8	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Table 3: Massive IIA brane configuration for $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory

where 6 denotes the new direction appeared after the T-dualization along $x_{\hat{6}}$-direction. This brane configuration is expected to coincide with the brane configuration described by the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ CS YM theory discussed in section 2.

Next we use the vacuum moduli space and the fuzzy funnel solution in section 3 to discuss the importance of D6-branes in the brane configuration of massive IIA string theory in Tab.3. From the vacuum moduli space in (3.27) we can infer that there are three massive directions for which $\langle \tilde{X}^{3,4,5} \rangle = 0$ and four flat directions for which $\langle \tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9} \rangle = diagonal$. The former indicates the fact that the D2-branes are not free to move in these directions, while they are free to move in the remaining four transverse directions. This moduli space and the supersymmetry structure in the massive IIA gravity [19] suggest the presence of D6-branes parallel to the D2-branes in addition to D8-branes. Moreover, the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ BPS fuzzy funnel solution, in which the seven transverse scalar fields are proportional to the seven generators (excluding T_8) of SU(3) with x_2-dependent coefficients, also seems to support our brane configuration. The solution is given by $\tilde{X}^{3,4,5} \sim (1/x_2)T_{1,2,3}$ and $\tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9} \sim (1/\sqrt{x_2})T_{4,5,6,7}$. The $(1/x_2)$-dependence of $\tilde{X}^{3,4,5}$ indicates the localization of the D8-branes along those directions without any interference from the D6-branes. On the other hand the $(1/\sqrt{x_2})$-dependence of $\tilde{X}^{6,7,8,9}$ indicates mild localization of the D8-branes along those directions due to an interference from the D6-branes which span the x_2-direction. Further evidence for this brane configuration should come from the BPS solutions in the massive IIA gravity. We leave this possibility for future investigation.

5   Conclusion

In this paper we carried out the MP Higgsing of the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT theory and obtained $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory in (2+1)-dimensions with U(N) gauge symmetry. We also verified that the MP Higgsing of the supersymmetry transformation rules of the GT theory results in the corresponding rules in the YM CS theory. Compared to the MP Higgsing of the ABJM theory, the present case is more subtle because of two reasons. First, non of the four complex scalars in the GT theory represent the flat direction of the bosonic potential and they can not acquire infinitely large vacuum expectation values. We overcame this problem by introducing field redefinitions which rotate the scalars to the flat directions of the bosonic potential. Second, in the GT theory we have two CS levels k_1 and k_2 and it is not clear how to take the large CS level limit. We took $k_1, k_2 \to \pm\infty$ limit under the assumption that $k_1 + k_2 = F_0$ and F_0 is a finite dimensionless parameter. It turns out that the F_0 is the CS level in the resulting YM CS theory.

Earlier, $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory was studied from different perspective [26, 27]. This theory is a deformation of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ YM theory in (2+1)-dimensions by a CS term. On the other hand, our $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory is a similar deformation of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ YM theory in (2+1)-dimensions. By comparing these two theories, one can realize that the former is obtained from the latter by turning off four massless scalars and their fermionic superpartners. An interesting difference between these two theories is the fact that in our theory we could find a non trivial fuzzy funnel solutions to the BPS equations while in their theory such BPS solution does not exist. In addition, the vacuum moduli space in our theory is $\left(\mathrm{R}^4 \times S^1\right)^N / S_N$, while it is trivial in their theory.

Since the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ YM CS theory we obtained in this paper is new, we found it interesting to figure out the brane configuration which can be described by this theory. We proposed that the theory describes the dynamics of N coincident D2-branes in the background of q D6-branes and the same number of D8-branes, q being the absolute value of the CS level F_0. More precisely, the branes system contains N D2-branes extending along the directions $x_{0,1,2}$, q D6-branes along the directions $x_{0,1,2,6,7,8,9}$, and q D8-branes along the directions $x_{0,1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9}$. As a confirmation of our brane configuration, we obtained $\mathcal{N} = 1$ BPS fuzzy funnel solution which indicates the localization of the D8-branes along the x_2-direction and supports the presence of D6-branes.

The massive IIA supergravity [30] is the low energy limit of the massive IIA string theory. This supergravity theory has many (non)supersymmetric solutions of the form $\mathrm{AdS}_4 \times \mathcal{M}_6$ [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 20, 37], where $\mathcal{M}_6$ represents a six dimensional manifold. The supersymmetries of these solutions are less than $\mathcal{N} = 3$. Since our massive IIA brane configuration in subsection 4.2 has $\mathcal{N} = 3$ supersymmetry, finding the corresponding solution in gravity side will be interesting.

Acknowledgements

A $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT Lagrangian after Field Redefinition

After the field redefinition (2.5), the $\mathcal{N} = 3$ GT Lagrangian in (2.1) is rewritten as

$$
\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathrm{tr}\big[- D_\mu X_A^\dagger D^\mu X^A - D_\mu Y^{\dagger A} D^\mu Y_A + i\chi_A^\dagger \gamma^\mu D_\mu \chi^A + i\lambda^{\dagger A} \gamma^\mu D_\mu \lambda_A \big],
$$

$$
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{CS}} = \frac{k_1}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \mathrm{tr}\Big(A_\mu \partial_\nu A_\rho + \frac{2i}{3} A_\mu A_\nu A_\rho \Big) + \frac{k_2}{4\pi} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho} \mathrm{tr}\Big(\hat{A}_\mu \partial_\nu \hat{A}_\rho + \frac{2i}{3} \hat{A}_\mu \hat{A}_\nu \hat{A}_\rho \Big),
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{ferm}} = & \frac{2\pi}{k_1} \mathrm{tr}\Big[(\lambda^{\dagger A} \chi_A^\dagger - \chi^A \lambda_A)(X^B Y_B + Y^{\dagger B} X_B^\dagger) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\big(\lambda^{\dagger A} X_A^\dagger - i\chi^A Y_A - iX^A \lambda_A + Y^{\dagger A}\chi_A^\dagger\big)\big(\lambda^{\dagger B} X_B^\dagger - i\chi^B Y_B - iX^B \lambda_B + Y^{\dagger B}\chi_B^\dagger\big) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\big(\chi^A X_A^\dagger + i\lambda^{\dagger A} Y_A - Y^{\dagger A}\lambda_A - iX^A \chi_A^\dagger\big)\big(\chi^B X_B^\dagger + i\lambda^{\dagger B} Y_B - Y^{\dagger B}\lambda_B - iX^B \chi_B^\dagger\big) \\
& + \sigma^A{}_C \sigma^B{}_D \big\{ (\chi^C \lambda_A + \lambda^{\dagger C}\chi_A^\dagger)(Y^{\dagger D}X_B^\dagger - X^D Y_B) + i(\lambda^{\dagger C}\lambda_A - \chi^C \chi_A^\dagger)(X^D X_B^\dagger - Y^{\dagger D}Y_B) \\
& \qquad - \frac{1}{2}(\chi^C X_A^\dagger - i\lambda^{\dagger C}Y_A - Y^{\dagger C}\lambda_A + iX^C \chi_A^\dagger)(\chi^D X_B^\dagger - i\lambda^{\dagger D}Y_B - Y^{\dagger D}\lambda_B + iX^D \chi_B^\dagger) \\
& \qquad + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda^{\dagger C}X_A^\dagger + i\chi^C Y_A + iX^C \lambda_A + Y^{\dagger C}\chi_A^\dagger)(\lambda^{\dagger D}X_B^\dagger + i\chi^D Y_B + iX^D \lambda_B + Y^{\dagger D}\chi_B^\dagger) \big\} \Big] \\
& + \frac{2\pi}{k_2} \mathrm{tr}\Big[(\chi_A^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger A} - \lambda_A \chi^A)(Y_B X^B + X_B^\dagger Y^{\dagger B}) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\big(X_A^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger A} - iY_A \chi^A - i\lambda_A X^A + \chi_A^\dagger Y^{\dagger A}\big)\big(X_B^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger B} - iY_B \chi^B - i\lambda_B X^B + \chi_B^\dagger Y^{\dagger B}\big) \\
& + \frac{1}{2}\big(X_A^\dagger \chi^A + iY_A \lambda^{\dagger A} - \lambda_A Y^{\dagger A} - i\chi_A^\dagger X^A\big)\big(X_B^\dagger \chi^B + iY_B \lambda^{\dagger B} - \lambda_B Y^{\dagger B} - i\chi_B^\dagger X^B\big) \\
\\
& + \sigma_A{}^C \sigma_B{}^D \big\{ (\lambda_C \chi^A + \chi_C^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger A})(X_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} - Y_D X^B) + i(\lambda_C \lambda^{\dagger A} - \chi_C^\dagger \chi^A)(X_D^\dagger X^B - Y_D Y^{\dagger B}) \\
& \qquad - \frac{1}{2}(X_C^\dagger \chi^A - iY_C \lambda^{\dagger A} - \lambda_C Y^{\dagger A} + i\chi_C^\dagger X^A)(X_D^\dagger \chi^B - iY_D \lambda^{\dagger B} - \lambda_D Y^{\dagger B} + i\chi_D^\dagger X^B) \\
& \qquad + \frac{1}{2}(X_C^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger A} + iY_C \chi^A + i\lambda_C X^A + \chi_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger A})(X_D^\dagger \lambda^{\dagger B} + iY_D \chi^B + i\lambda_D X^B + \chi_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger B}) \big\} \Big],
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}} = {}&-\frac{4\pi^2}{k_1^2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(X^A X_A^\dagger + Y^{\dagger A} Y_A\big)\big(X^B Y_B + Y^{\dagger B} X_B^\dagger\big)(X^C Y_C + Y^{\dagger C} X_C^\dagger) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X^B X_D^\dagger + X^B Y_D - Y^{\dagger B} X_D^\dagger - Y^{\dagger B} Y_D) \\
&\quad \times (X^A X_A^\dagger - X^A Y_A - Y^{\dagger A} X_A^\dagger + Y^{\dagger A} Y_A)(X^E X_C^\dagger - X^E Y_C + Y^{\dagger E} X_C^\dagger - Y^{\dagger E} Y_C) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X_A^\dagger X^B + Y_A X^B - X_A^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} - Y_A Y^{\dagger B}) \\
&\quad \times (X_D^\dagger X^E + Y_D X^E + X_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger E} + Y_D Y^{\dagger E})(X_C^\dagger X^A - Y_C X^A + X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger A} - Y_C Y^{\dagger A})\Big] \\
&- \frac{4\pi^2}{k_2^2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(X_A^\dagger X^A + Y_A Y^{\dagger A}\big)\big(X_B^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} + Y_B X^B\big)(X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger C} + Y_C X^C) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X_D^\dagger X^B + Y_D X^B - X_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} - Y_D Y^{\dagger B}) \\
&\quad \times (X_A^\dagger X^A + Y_A X^A + X_A^\dagger Y^{\dagger A} + Y_A Y^{\dagger A})(X_C^\dagger X^E - Y_C X^E + X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger E} - Y_C Y^{\dagger E}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X^A X_D^\dagger + X^A Y_D - Y^{\dagger A} X_D^\dagger - Y^{\dagger A} Y_D) \\
&\quad \times (X^B X_C^\dagger - X^B Y_C - Y^{\dagger B} X_C^\dagger + Y^{\dagger B} Y_C)(X^E X_A^\dagger - X^E Y_A + Y^{\dagger E} X_A^\dagger - Y^{\dagger E} Y_A)\Big] \\
&- \frac{8\pi^2}{k_1 k_2}\text{tr}\Big[\big(X^A Y_A + Y^{\dagger A} X_A^\dagger\big)\big\{X^B(X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger C} + Y_C X^C)X_B^\dagger + Y^{\dagger B}(X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger C} + Y_C X^C)Y_B\big\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X^B X_D^\dagger + X^B Y_D - Y^{\dagger B} X_D^\dagger - Y^{\dagger B} Y_D) \\
&\quad \times (X^A X_C^\dagger - X^A Y_C - Y^{\dagger A} X_C^\dagger + Y^{\dagger A} Y_C)(X^E X_A^\dagger - X^E Y_A + Y^{\dagger E} X_A^\dagger - Y^{\dagger E} Y_A) \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X_A^\dagger X^B + Y_A X^B - X_A^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} - Y_A Y^{\dagger B}) \\
&\quad \times (X_D^\dagger X^A + Y_D X^A + X_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger A} + Y_D Y^{\dagger A})(X_C^\dagger X^E - Y_C X^E + X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger E} - Y_C Y^{\dagger E}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X_D^\dagger X^B + Y_D X^B - X_D^\dagger Y^{\dagger B} - Y_D Y^{\dagger B}) \\
&\quad \times (X_A^\dagger X^E + Y_A X^E + X_A^\dagger Y^{\dagger E} + Y_A Y^{\dagger E})(X_C^\dagger X^A - Y_C X^A + X_C^\dagger Y^{\dagger A} - Y_C Y^{\dagger A}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\sigma_B{}^D \sigma^C{}_E (X^A X_D^\dagger + X^A Y_D - Y^{\dagger A} X_D^\dagger - Y^{\dagger A} Y_D) \\
&\quad \times (X^B X_A^\dagger - X^B Y_A - Y^{\dagger B} X_A^\dagger + Y^{\dagger B} Y_A)(X^E X_C^\dagger - X^E Y_C + Y^{\dagger E} X_C^\dagger - Y^{\dagger E} Y_C)\Big].
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.36}
$$

B   Seven Dimensional Euclidean Gamma Matrices

In subsection 2.2 we have seen that the MP Higgsing of the fermionic potential gives the fermionic mass term and Yukawa-type coupling which is expressed in terms of seven dimensional Euclidean

Gamma matrices. In this appendix we list the the Gamma matrices which were determined by the Higgsing procedure,

$$\Gamma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Gamma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\Gamma_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

References

[1] A. Hanany, E. Witten, "Type IIB superstrings, BPS monopoles, and three-dimensional gauge dynamics," Nucl. Phys. **B492**, 152-190 (1997). [hep-th/9611230].

[2] T. Kitao, K. Ohta and N. Ohta, "Three-dimensional gauge dynamics from brane configurations with (p,q) - five-brane," Nucl. Phys. B **539**, 79 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9808111].

[3] O. Bergman, A. Hanany, A. Karch and B. Kol, "Branes and supersymmetry breaking in three-dimensional gauge theories," JHEP **9910**, 036 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9908075].

[4] K. Ohta, "Moduli space of vacua of supersymmetric Chern-Simons theories and type IIB branes," JHEP **9906**, 025 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9904118].

[5] B. H. Lee, H. j. Lee, N. Ohta and H. S. Yang, "Maxwell Chern-Simons solitons from type IIB string theory," Phys. Rev. D **60**, 106003 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9904181].

[6] T. Kitao, N. Ohta, "Spectrum of Maxwell-Chern-Simons theory realized on type IIB Brane configurations," Nucl. Phys. **B578**, 215-238 (2000). [hep-th/9908006].

[7] K. Ohta, "Supersymmetric index and s rule for type IIB branes," JHEP **9910**, 006 (1999). [hep-th/9908120].

[8] O. Aharony, O. Bergman, D. L. Jafferis, J. Maldacena, "N=6 superconformal Chern-Simons-matter theories, M2-branes and their gravity duals," JHEP **0810**, 091 (2008) [arXiv:0806.1218 [hep-th]].

[9] K. Hosomichi, K. M. Lee, S. Lee, S. Lee and J. Park, "N=5,6 Superconformal Chern-Simons Theories and M2-branes on Orbifolds," JHEP **0809**, 002 (2008) [arXiv:0806.4977 [hep-th]].

[10] O. Aharony, O. Bergman and D. L. Jafferis, "Fractional M2-branes," JHEP **0811**, 043 (2008) [arXiv:0807.4924 [hep-th]].

[11] O. Aharony, A. Hashimoto, S. Hirano, P. Ouyang, "D-brane Charges in Gravitational Duals of 2+1 Dimensional Gauge Theories and Duality Cascades," JHEP **1001**, 072 (2010). [arXiv:0906.2390 [hep-th]].

[12] M. B. Green, C. M. Hull and P. K. Townsend, "D-brane Wess-Zumino actions, t duality and the cosmological constant," Phys. Lett. B **382**, 65 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9604119].

[13] E. Bergshoeff, P. K. Townsend, "Super D-branes," Nucl. Phys. **B490**, 145-162 (1997). [hep-th/9611173].

[14] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, M. B. Green, G. Papadopoulos and P. K. Townsend, "Duality of type II 7 branes and 8 branes," Nucl. Phys. B **470**, 113 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9601150].

[15] B. R. Greene, A. D. Shapere, C. Vafa, S. -T. Yau, "Stringy Cosmic Strings and Noncompact Calabi-Yau Manifolds," Nucl. Phys. **B337**, 1 (1990).

[16] D. Gaiotto, A. Tomasiello, "The gauge dual of Romans mass," JHEP **1001**, 015 (2010) [arXiv:0901.0969 [hep-th]].

[17] D. Gaiotto, A. Tomasiello, "Perturbing gauge/gravity duals by a Romans mass," J. Phys. A **A42**, 465205 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3959 [hep-th]].

[18] O. Bergman, G. Lifschytz, "Branes and massive IIA duals of 3d CFT's," JHEP **1004**, 114 (2010). [arXiv:1001.0394 [hep-th]].

[19] M. Fujita, W. Li, S. Ryu, T. Takayanagi, "Fractional Quantum Hall Effect via Holography: Chern-Simons, Edge States, and Hierarchy," JHEP **0906**, 066 (2009). [arXiv:0901.0924 [hep-th]].

[20] O. Aharony, D. Jafferis, A. Tomasiello, A. Zaffaroni, "Massive type IIA string theory cannot be strongly coupled," JHEP **1011**, 047 (2010). [arXiv:1007.2451 [hep-th]].

[21] T. Suyama, "On Large N Solution of Gaiotto-Tomasiello Theory," JHEP **1010**, 101 (2010) [arXiv:1008.3950 [hep-th]];

D. L. Jafferis, I. R. Klebanov, S. S. Pufu, B. R. Safdi, "Towards the F-Theorem: N=2 Field Theories on the Three-Sphere," JHEP **1106**, 102 (2011) [arXiv:1103.1181 [hep-th]];

T. Suyama, "Eigenvalue Distributions in Matrix Models for CS-matter Theories," arXiv:1106.3147 [hep-th].

[22] O-K. Kwon, D. D. Tolla, "On the Vacua of Mass-deformed Gaiotto-Tomasiello Theories," JHEP **1108**, 043 (2011). [arXiv:1106.3700 [hep-th]].

[23] S. Mukhi, C. Papageorgakis, "M2 to D2," JHEP **0805**, 085 (2008) [arXiv:0803.3218 [hep-th]].

[24] Y. Pang and T. Wang, "From N M2's to N D2's," Phys. Rev. D **78**, 125007 (2008) [arXiv:0807.1444 [hep-th]].

[25] Y. Kim, O. K. Kwon and D. D. Tolla, "Mass-Deformed Super Yang-Mills Theories from M2-Branes with Flux," JHEP **1109** (2011) 077 [arXiv:1106.3866 [hep-th]].

[26] H. C. Kao, "Selfdual Yang-Mills Chern-Simons Higgs systems with an N=3 extended supersymmetry," Phys. Rev. D **50**, 2881 (1994).

[27] H. C. Kao, K. M. Lee and T. Lee, "The Chern-Simons coefficient in supersymmetric Yang-Mills Chern-Simons theories," Phys. Lett. B **373**, 94 (1996) [arXiv:hep-th/9506170].

[28] J. H. Brodie, "D-branes in massive IIA and solitons in Chern-Simons theory," JHEP **0111**, 014 (2001) [arXiv:hep-th/0012068].

[29] Y. Imamura, "A D-2-brane realization of Maxwell-Chern-Simons-Higgs systems," JHEP **0102**, 035 (2001). [hep-th/0012254].

[30] L. J. Romans, "Massive N=2a Supergravity in Ten-Dimensions," Phys. Lett. **B169**, 374 (1986).

[31] K. Behrndt and M. Cvetic, "General N=1 supersymmetric fluxes in massive type IIA string theory," Nucl. Phys. B **708**, 45 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0407263].

[32] D. Lust and D. Tsimpis, "Supersymmetric AdS(4) compactifications of IIA supergravity," JHEP **0502**, 027 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0412250].

[33] A. Tomasiello, "New string vacua from twistor spaces," Phys. Rev. D **78**, 046007 (2008) [arXiv:0712.1396 [hep-th]].

[34] P. Koerber, D. Lust and D. Tsimpis, "Type IIA AdS(4) compactifications on cosets, interpolations and domain walls," JHEP **0807**, 017 (2008) [arXiv:0804.0614 [hep-th]].

[35] M. Petrini and A. Zaffaroni, "N=2 solutions of massive type IIA and their CS duals," JHEP **0909**, 107 (2009) [arXiv:0904.4915 [hep-th]].

[36] D. Lust and D. Tsimpis, "New supersymmetric AdS(4) type II vacua," JHEP **0909** (2009) 098 [arXiv:0906.2561 [hep-th]].

[37] A. Tomasiello and A. Zaffaroni, "Parameter spaces of massive IIA solutions," JHEP **1104**, 067 (2011) [arXiv:1010.4648 [hep-th]].